	Case/1:04-cv-1	1671-JLT	Document 1	Filed 07/28/20	04 Page 1	of 11
MOUNT \$	193				_	
JUMMONS IS JOUAL RULF 4 WAIVER FURN MCF ISSUEDL BY DPTY, CLK	4.1			DISTRICT COUR MASSACHUSETT		e Section
DATE	7-28-04					
	INTRUSIC, INC.	Plai	intiff,	) ) ) Civil A	action No.	
	INTRUSEC, INC.			) ) ) JURY :	TRIAL REQU	ESTED
		Def	endant.	í		1 JLT
		<del>.</del>			MAGISTRATE JL	IDGE Din

### **COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Intrusic, Inc. for its Complaint alleges as follows:

### I. JURISDICTION

- 1. This is an action for trademark infringement and false designation of origin arising under the Trademark Laws of the United States, 15 U.S.C. §1051, et seq. ("Lanham Act"), and related claims of trademark infringement and unfair competition under the common law.
- 2. Federal jurisdiction in this action is based upon 15 U.S.C. §1121 (Lanham Act, §39) and 28 U.S.C. §§1331, 1332 and 1338 (a) and (b).
- 3. Alternatively, and with respect to those parts of the action that do not present a federal question, federal jurisdiction is based upon 28 U.S.C. §1337 (supplemental jurisdiction).

### II. THE PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff Intrusic, Inc. (hereafter "Intrusic" or "Plaintiff") is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 330 Bear Hill Road, Suite 220, Waltham, Massachusetts 02451.
- 5. Defendant Intrusec, Inc. (hereafter "Intrusec" or "Defendant") is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation having its place of business at 75 Fifth Street, N.W., Suite 207, Atlanta, Georgia 30308. Intrusec is, upon information and belief, conducting business in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

### III. THE PLAINTIFF'S MARK

- 6. Plaintiff Intrusic is the owner of the trademark and trade name INTRUSIC for network security software. Plaintiff Intrusic is in the business of, <u>interalia</u>, designing, manufacturing and selling network security software, principally to enterprise clients, throughout the United States. Sales of network security software, under the Intrusic name, are made directly by Intrusic throughout the United States, including the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
- 7. On March 6, 2002, Plaintiff filed an amendment to its Articles of Organization changing its corporate name and trade name to Intrusic, Inc.
- 8. Plaintiff, Intrusic, has been using the trade name Intrusic to identify as a network security software company since at least March 6, 2002. In order that it could identify itself to the network security software purchasing public via the internet, on February 13, 2002, it also secured the URL <a href="www.intrusic.com">www.intrusic.com</a>. Plaintiff had established website available at that URL at least as early as September 27, 2002.

- 9. Plaintiff, Intrusic, began use of its INTRUSIC mark on or in connection with the goods in interstate commerce at least as early as about August 14, 2002. Over the past several years, Plaintiff Intrusic has committed significant time, effort, and money to developing and maintaining a reputation for quality of products and reliability in the field of the network security software.
- 10. Plaintiff is seeking federal trademark registration for the INTRUSIC mark. The application therefore was filed on November 11, 2003 and has been accorded Serial No. 78/325892. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (hereinafter "PTO") initially refused registration for this mark on the grounds that it was confusingly similar to the application for registration of INTRUSEC filed by Defendant. That refusal was withdrawn only to the extent that the Examining Attorney had erroneously believed that Defendant's application was the first filed, and thus not entitled to registration. Plaintiff's application has now been approved for publication in the Official Gazette.
- 11. Due to its inherently distinctive nature and by virtue of its exclusive use by Plaintiff Intrusic, the INTRUSIC mark and trade name has come to serve as a designation of origin of Plaintiff Intrusic's network security software to the consuming public. Plaintiff has built up a valuable reputation and goodwill in connection with its products, by virtue of its history of commitment to high quality products and due to its promotion and the extensive press coverage thereof.

### IV. THE DEFENDANT'S INFRINGEMENT

Upon information and belief, Defendant Intrusec is a Delaware 12. corporation located in Atlanta, Georgia, originally incorporated in Georgia on

October 19, 2002. Defendant is engaged in the manufacture and sale of network security software, principally to enterprise clients.

- offering network security software products through its website for beta testing only no earlier than February 2003 under the name INTRUSEC (hereafter "the infringing trade name and mark") in competition with Plaintiff. Sales of products under the INTRUSEC trade name and mark began sometime thereafter, and at least six months after Plaintiff's sales of INTRUSIC products had commenced. Defendant's sales and offers for sale have been and are being made in commerce in the United States, including, upon information and belief, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
- similar to Plaintiff's INTRUSIC trade name and mark. The Intrusec infringing trade name and mark is used for the same type of products as the products sold by Plaintiff under the INTRUSIC mark, and the Defendant's INTRUSEC products and services travel in the same channels of trade as Plaintiff's INTRUSIC brand products. Upon information and belief, Defendant's first sale of its products and services with the infringing mark in the United States occurred more than six months after Plaintiff's first use of the INTRUSIC trade name and mark.
- 15. Plaintiff is aware of instances of actual confusion in which the consuming public of network security software has believed that there is an affiliation or sponsorship between Plaintiff Intrusic and Defendant Intrusec by virtue of the high degree of similarity in their respective trade names and trademarks, INTRUSIC and INTRUSEC for network security software.

- 16. On March 16, 2004, Intrusec applied for registration of the mark INTRUSEC in the United States Patent and Trademark Office (hereafter "PTO"), Serial No. 78/384985. Intrusec is not entitled to registration of the INTRUSEC name on the grounds that it so resembles Intrusic's INTRUSIC mark when used with the Intrusec goods to cause confusion mistake or deception.
- 17. Defendant is not now and has never been authorized or licensed in any way by Plaintiff to use or exploit Plaintiff's Intrusic mark or any mark similar thereto, in connection with Defendant's business.
- 18. Plaintiff has not consented to the use of the infringing mark by Defendant, and, on information and belief, Defendant is or should be aware of Plaintiff's Intrusic mark and trade name.
- 19. In spite of this presumed awareness, Defendant Intrusec, upon information and belief, continues to manufacture, sell and offer for sale network security software with the infringing mark in the United States, through the same or similar channels of trade as Plaintiff.
- 20. Upon information and belief, Defendant has a substantial inventory bearing the infringing mark and has already sold a number of these products. Plaintiff will be irreparably harmed by Defendant's continued sales in the United States of the Intrusec products bearing the infringing mark and continued use of the infringing trade name and mark.

### V. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

## COUNT ONE (False Designation of Origin)

- 21. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 20 above with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.
- 22. Defendant, by its conduct described above, is using, in connection with sales in commerce in the United States, a false designation and representation of the origin of Defendant's goods and a false designation and representation of sponsorship, authorization by or in connection with Plaintiff's goods, all in willful violation of 15 U.S.C. §1125(a) (Lanham Act, §43(a)).
- 23. Such conduct by Defendant, if not enjoined, will cause confusion, deception or mistake as to the source of origin or sponsorship of Defendant's goods with Plaintiff's goods.

# COUNT TWO (Common Law Trademark Infringement)

- 24. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 23 above with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.
- 25. Upon information and belief, Defendant, by its conduct described above, is selling, offering to sell and/or using in commerce in Massachusetts a colorable imitation of Plaintiff's INTRUSIC mark in connection with the sale, offering for sale, distribution, and advertising of its network security software. Defendant's use of this infringing mark is likely to cause confusion or mistake or deception among purchasers of network security software as to the source of origin or sponsorship or endorsement of such goods and services, or wrongly lead consumers to conclude that some connection,

authorization, or relationship exists between Defendant and Plaintiff, all in willful violation of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Such conduct by Defendant, if not enjoined, will cause confusion, 26. mistake or deception as to the source of origin or sponsorship of Defendant's goods with Plaintiff's goods.

## COUNT THREE

(Common Law Unfair Competition)

- Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 27. through 26 above with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.
- Defendant, by its conduct described above, is using, in connection 28. with sales in commerce in the United States, a false designation and representation of the origin of Defendant's goods and a false designation and representation of sponsorship, authorization by or in connection with Plaintiff's goods, all in willful violation of the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
- Such conduct by Defendant, if not enjoined, will cause confusion, 29. mistake or deception as to the source of origin or sponsorship of Defendant's goods with Plaintiff's goods.

#### VI. DAMAGES AND IRREPARABLE HARM

Defendant's conduct as described in paragraphs 1 through 29 above 30. has caused damage and injury to Plaintiff for which Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law unless such acts are enjoined by this Court.

### VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays:

- That this Court preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendant Α. from infringing Plaintiff's INTRUSIC mark and trade name, and, in particular, from manufacturing, importing, distributing, soliciting orders for, using, or causing to be used the INTRUSEC mark and all colorable imitations or variations thereof in connection with its business;
- That Defendant be required to pay Plaintiff the actual damages it B. has sustained as a consequence of Defendant's actions, with costs and attorneys' fees, if applicable; and that Plaintiff's damages be trebled as a consequence of Defendant's willful infringement of Plaintiff's mark in accordance with 15 U.S.C. §1117 (Lanham Act, §35);
- That Defendant be ordered to account for and to pay Plaintiff all C. profits derived by Defendant by reason of its acts of infringement and in violation of law as alleged herein;
- That Defendant's federal application for registration of the D. INTRUSEC trademark be expressly withdrawn, and that the Court declare that Defendant has no right to register any variant of the INTRUSEC trademark upon any register maintained by the Patent and Trademark Office;
- That this Court order that all goods consisting of printing plates, all E. packaging, labels, signs, prints, stationery, packages, receptacles and advertisements in the possession, custody or control of Defendant bearing the INTRUSEC mark or any

colorable imitation thereof and all means of making the same shall be delivered up and destroyed;

- F. That Defendant be required to promptly file with this Court and serve on Plaintiff's counsel a report, under oath, setting forth the manner and form in which they have complied and are complying with said injunction; and
- G. That this Court grant Plaintiff such other relief as it deems just and reasonable.

### VIII. JURY REQUEST

Plaintiff requests trial by jury on all claims so triable.

Dated: July  $\stackrel{\frown}{\cancel{\times}}$ , 2004

Respectfully submitted,

INTRUSIC, INC.

Bv:

Heidi Schiller, Esq. (BBO#543785) Law Offices of Heidi Schiller 405 Waltham Street, PMB 406

Lexington, MA 02421

Tel: (617) 504-0436 Fax: (617) 507-6585

E-mail: hs1@mindspring.com

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

						<del></del>		
Catego	ry in whic	h the case belongs base	ed upon the r	numbered nature of sui	t code liste	d on the civil o	over sheet.	(See
local ru	ule 40.1(a)(	1)).						
	l.	160, 410, 470, R.23, R	EGARDLESS	OF NATURE OF SUIT.				
✓	II.	195, 368, 400, 440, 4 740, 790, 791, 820*, 8	41-444, 540, 830*, 840*, 8:	550, 555, 625, 710, 726 50, 890, 892-894, 895, 9	0, 730, 950.	*Also comple for patent, tr		r AO 121 copyright case
	III.	110, 120, 130, 140, 1 315, 320, 330, 340, 3 380, 385, 450, 891.	51, 190, 210, 45, 350, 355	, 230, 240, 245, 290, 31 , 360, 362, 365, 370, 37	10, 71,			
	IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 4	60, 510, 530	, 610, 620, 630, 640, 65	50, 660,			
1200		690, 810, 861-865, 8						
	V.	150, 152, 153.		()4 -		67	1 J	
this di	istrict plea	r, if any, of related cases se indicate the title and	number of th	e first filed case in this	cont.		<u>.</u>	
Has a	prior actio	on between the same pa	rties and bas	sed on the same claim	ever been f		urt?	
					YES	NO	[√]	(500
		aint in this case question	i the constitu	itionality of an act of co	ongress aπ	ecting the publ	ic interest?	(See
28 05	iC §2403)					- 1	1	
и	:- 45 11 6	A. or an officer, agent or	employee of	f the U.S. a narty?	YES L	NO		
IT \$0, I	is the U.S.	4. Or an officer, agent of	employee of	tale o.o. a party.			7	
					YES L	NO	LY	
Is this	s case requ	ired to be heard and de	termined by	a district court of three	judges pu	rsuant to title 2	28 USC §2284	17
					YES	NO	100	
Do <u>all</u> Massa 40.1(d	achusetts	ties in this action, excli ("governmental agencie	uding govern es"), residin	nmental agencies of the g in Massachusetts res	side in the s	same division?	mmonwealth	of Il Rule
					YES		<b>✓</b>	
	A.	If yes, in which divi	sion do <u>all</u> of	f the non-governmenta	I parties re			
		Eastern Division		Central Division		Western	Division	<b>L</b>
			ion da tha	aiority of the plaintiffs	or the only	parties, exclud	ling governm	ental
	В.	If no, in which divis agencies, residing						·
	В.						Division	
	ng a Notice	agencies, residing Eastern Division of Removal - are there	in Massachu	usetts reside? Central Division pending in the state co		Western		? (If
	ng a Notice	agencies, residing Eastern Division	in Massachu	usetts reside? Central Division pending in the state co	urt requirin	Western g the attention		? (If
yes, s	ng a Notice submit a s	agencies, residing Eastern Division of Removal - are there a eparate sheet identifying	in Massachu	usetts reside? Central Division pending in the state co		Western		? (If
yes, : ASE TYP	ng a Notice submit a s	agencies, residing Eastern Division of Removal - are there a eparate sheet identifying	in Massachu	usetts reside? Central Division pending in the state co	urt requirin	Western g the attention		? (If
yes, : ASE TYP ORNEY'S	ng a Notice submit a s PE OR PRIN S NAME <u>H</u>	agencies, residing Eastern Division of Removal - are there a eparate sheet identifying	in Massachu	usetts reside?  Central Division  pending in the state co	urt requirin	Western g the attention		? (If

### CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

				DEFENDANTS	3	A STATE OF THE STA	
l. (a) PLAINTIFFS							
Intrusic, Inc.				Intrusic, Inc.			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Middlesex  (EXCEPTINALS PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence	e of First Listed		
(b) County of Residence of I	First Listed Plaintill EPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF C.	ASES)		, i	ONLIS PLAINTIFF CASES	ONLY) * ****	
(EXC	2PT IN 0.3. PERMATE C	, (122-2)		NOTE: IN LAND	CONDEMNATION CASES, USE IVOLVED.	THE LOCATION OF THE	
				l			
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name.	, Address, and Telephone N	umber)		Attorneys (If Know			
	Schiller, Esq.		U	<b>T</b>	1671	_	
AOS Walth	nam Street, PME	3 406		-		IIm	
Tavington	MA 02421			1		ULT	
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. C	CITIZENSHIP OF PE	RINCIPAL PARTIES(PI	lace an "A m O Box for Plaintiff and One Box for De fendant)	
II. BASIS OF TOKISDA	CITOIV (Fined an Fr in		(F	or Diversity Cases Only)	DEF	DEF	
☐ 1 U.S. Government	nt Not a Party)		itizen of This State	Principal Place 🗍 4 🔲 4 This State			
Plaintiff	(0.5, 000011110			Ca atCreate [7]	2 2 Incorporated and	Principal Place 🗆 5 🗆 5	
2 U.S. Government	4 Diversity	nchin of Parties	(	Citizen of Another State	of Business In	Another State	
Defendant	in Item III)	renship of Parties			3 🔲 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
			۰ ا	Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	3 🔲 3 Foreign Nation		
	(Place an "X" in O	no Box Only)	1	1 Gleigh Conton)		The second	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	r (Place an X in O		Ti	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
CONTRACT		PERSONAL INJU		610 Agriculture	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	400 State Reap partionment	
110 insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	362 Personal injury-	- [	620 Other Food & Drug	3 423 Withdrawal	130 Banks and Banking	
130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Product	Med. Malpracti		625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC	28 USC 157	450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc.	
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability  120 Assault, Libel &	Product Liabilit	у 📙	□ 630 Liquor Laws □ 640 R.R. & Truck	PROPERTY RIGHTS	470 Racketter Influenced and	
& Enforcement of	Siander  330 Federal Employers'	36% Ashestos Perso Injury Product	1	1 650 Airline Regs.	☐ 820 Copyrights	Corrupt Organizations    XIO Selective Service	
152 Recovery of Defauted	Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPI		Safety/Health	S30 Patent	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/	
Student Loans	340 Marine 345 Marine Product	370 Other Fraud	- 1	690 Other		Exchange  875 Customer Challenge	
(Excl. Veterans)  [] 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	371 Truth in Lendir 380 Other Personal		LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	12 USC 3410  B91 Agricultural Acts	
of Veteran's Benefits  [] 160 Stockholders' Suits	350 M olar V chicle 355 M olar V chicle	Property Dama	ge	110 Pair Labor Sundards	☐ 861 H IA (13 95m)	🔲 892 Economic Stabilization Act	
196 Other Contract	Product Liability  360 Other Personal Injury	385 Property Dama Product Liabili		Act 710 Labor/Mgmt. Relation	□ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIW C/DIW W (405 (g))	☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 894 Energy Albeation Act	
195 Contract Product Liability	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETI	TIONS		☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	895 Freedom of Information Act	
REAL PROPERTY		516 Michigas to Va		☐ 730 Labor/M gmt.Reputiin & Disclosure Act	FEDERAL TAXSUITS	☐ 900 Appeal of Fee	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Force losure	441 Voting 3 442 Employment	Sentence		740 Railway Labor Act		Delegning Pflual Access to Justice	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment		Habeas Corpus:		790 Other Labor Laigato	n B70 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	950 Constitutionality of	
240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	444 Welfare	535 De ath Penalty		791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	S71 IRS —Third Party	State Statutes  3 890 Other Statutory Actions	
290 All Other Real Property	440 Other Civil Rights	540 Mandamus &	Cinci	Security Act	26 USC 7609		
		S55 Prison Candi	ion			Appeal to	
(PLA	CE AN "X" IN ONE BO	OX ONLY)		Tran	sferred from	District Judge from	
V. ORIGIN	ר רייין		□ 4	Reinstated or 5 (spec	her district G Multidi	strict Magistrate	
۰۰۰۰ کیا در	Con Court	Remanded from Appellate Court		Reopened	Din Bo	on Judgment	
Proceeding	(Cite the U.S. Civil St	titute under which you a	re fling	and write beef stamment of caus	¢.		
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	Do not cite juristicti	onal statutes unless diver	rstty.)	coment and falc	e designation o	f origin.	
15 U.S.C. §10	51 <u>et seq</u> - Tra	ademark inr	TIUS	ement and rare	e designation o	nly if demanded in complaint:	
VII. REQUESTED		HS IS A CLASS AC		DEMAND S	JURY DEMAN	ily il deligitaes in completion	
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.	CP. 23			JUNE DESTINA		
	(See						
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) instructions):				P+	DOCKET NUMBER		
IF ANY		£					
OATE		SIGNATURE	FATTO	INEY OF RECORD	$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}}$		
July 27, 20	004	X/	1/1/2	A. C. Xh. K.	<u>.4. [ 1                                 </u>	<u> </u>	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		14	12.	11100 000	MAG.	JUDGE	
RECEIPT #	AMOUN	APPLYING I	FP	IUDGE			